REMARKS

[0010] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims 1-39 are currently pending
- Claims 14, 16, 22-31, and 33 are canceled herein
- Claims 1-13, 15, 17-21, 32, 34, 35, and 37 are amended herein

[0011] Support for the amendments to claims 1-13, 15, 17-21, 32, 34, 35, and 37 is found in the specification at least at the following locations in the specification:

- Figure 2
- Paragraph [0031]
- Paragraph [0022]
- Figure 6
- Paragraph [0041]
- Paragraph [0034]
- Paragraph [0037]
- Paragraph [0035]

Serial No.: 10/769,425 Atty Docket No.: MS1 -1911US Atty/Agent: Kayla D. Brant Claims 1-15 Recite Statutory Subject Matter Under § 101

[0012] Claims 1-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed

to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

[0013] Nevertheless, for the sole purpose of expediting prosecution and without

commenting on the propriety of the Office's rejections, Applicant herein amends claims

1-15 as shown above. Applicant respectfully submits that these amendments render

the § 101 rejection moot.

Cited Documents

[0014] The following documents have been applied to reject one or more claims of

the Application:

• Tang: Tang, U.S. Patent No. 5,793,365

• Lee: Lee et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,330,845

Puskala: Puskala et al., U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0165024

Serial No.: 10/769,425 Atty Docket No.: MS1 -1911US Atty/Agent: Kayla D. Brant

lee@haves The Business of IP®

-15-

Claims 1-15, 20-34, and 36-39 Are Non-Obvious Over Tang and Lee

[0015] Claims 1-15, 20-34, and 36-39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as

allegedly being obvious over Tang in view of Lee. Applicant respectfully traverses the

rejection.

Independent Claim 1

[0016] Applicant submits that the Office has not made a prima facie showing that

independent claim 1 is obvious in view of the combination of Tang and Lee. Applicant

submits that the combination of Tang and Lee does not teach or suggest the following

features of this claim, as amended (with emphasis added):

...a group interaction application maintained in the memory and

executed on the processor to present a graphical user interface

associated with the group interaction application for facilitating a group

interaction among a first user and one or more other users, the graphical

user interface comprising:

a group identification area configured to display visual

representations of a plurality of online social groups in which the first

user is a member, wherein:

a user's membership in the group is maintained when the

user is offline; and

the visual representations of online social groups are

automatically arranged by at least one of:

a geographic location associated with a member of one

of the online social groups;

a date and time of a most recent communication

between the first user and another member of one of the

online social groups; and

Serial No.: 10/769,425 Atty Docket No.: MS1 -1911US

Atty/Agent: Kayla D. Brant

-16- Lee@hayes The Business of IP*

www.leehayes.com • 509.324.9256

a frequency of communication between the first user

and another member of one of the online social groups; and

a group activities menu comprising one or more selectable items

representing social activities in which the first user, as a member of a

selected group may participate, such that a plurality of group activities

in which a member of the selected group who is logged on via a mobile

device may participate is different than a plurality of group activities in

which a member of the selected group who is logged on via a non-

mobile device may participate.

[0017] Claim 1 recites in part, "display visual representations of a plurality of online

social groups in which the first user is a member." The Office cites Tang, Fig. 1A, Fig.

5, Col. 4, lines 66-67 as teaching this element. (Office Action, page 2.) In contrast,

Tang describes a gallery window that "provides a visual mechanism for informing the

current worker of the presence and communication opportunities for a user-defined set

of group members." (Tang, Col. 5, lines 5-7.) Furthermore, "Fig. 5 illustrates one

embodiment of a chat room window 30. In the chat room window 30 there is displayed

the icon 14 associated with each worker who is presently in the chat room." (Tang, Col.

9, lines 26-29.)

[0018] The cited portions of Tang describe visual representations of multiple users.

In contrast, claim 1 specifies "visual representations of a plurality of online social

groups." Furthermore, claim 1, as amended, further specifies, "wherein a user's

membership in the group is maintained when the user is offline." The chat rooms

described in Tang represent collections of users who are currently online. A user's

membership in a chat room, as described in Tang, is not maintained when the user is

-17-

offline.

Serial No.: 10/769,425

Atty Docket No.: MS1 -1911US

Atty/Agent: Kayla D. Brant

lee®haves The Business of IP®

www.leehayes.com * 509.324.9256

[0019] In addition, claim 1, as amended herein, recites in part, "a plurality of group

activities in which a member of the selected group who is logged on via a mobile device

may participate is different than a plurality of group activities in which a member of the

selected group who is logged on via a non-mobile device may participate." None of the

cited references teach or suggest different online social activities being made available

to a user based on whether the user is connect via a mobile device or a non-mobile

device.

[0020] Consequently, the combination of Tang and Lee does not teach or suggest all

of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests

that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 2-15 and 20-22

[0021] Claims 14 and 22 are canceled herein, rendering the rejection of claims 14

and 22 moot.

[0022] Claims 2-13, 15, 20, and 21 ultimately depend from independent claim 1. As

discussed above, claim 1 is patentable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 2-

13, 15, 20, and 21 are also patentable over the cited documents of record for at least

their dependency from a patentable base claim. These claims may also be patentable

-18-

for the additional features that each recites.

Serial No.: 10/769,425 Atty Docket No.: MS1 -1911US

Atty/Agent: Kayla D. Brant

lee**®**haves The Business of IP®

www.leehayes.com * 509.324.9256

<u>Independent Claim 23</u>

[0023] Claim 23 is canceled herein, rendering the rejection of claim 23 moot.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 24-29

[0024] Claims 24-29 are canceled herein, rendering the rejection of these claims

moot. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of these claims be

withdrawn.

Independent Claim 30

[0025] Claim 30 is canceled herein, rendering the rejection of claim 30 moot.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

<u>Dependent Claim 31</u>

[0026] Claim 31 is canceled herein, rendering the rejection of claim 31 moot.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

-19-

Serial No.: 10/769,425 Atty Docket No.: MS1 -1911US Atty/Agent: Kayla D. Brant

ke@haves The Business of IP®

www.leehayes.com • 509.324.9256

Independent Claim 32

[0027] Applicant submits that the Office has not made a prima facie showing that

independent claim 32 is obvious in view of the combination of Tang and Lee.

Furthermore, claim 32 is amended herein to recite elements similar to those discussed

above with reference to claim 1.

[0028] Consequently, for reasons similar to those presented above with reference to

claim 1, Applicant submits that the combination of Tang and Lee does not teach or

suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant

respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 33, 34, and 36

[0029] Claim 33 is canceled herein, rendering the rejection of claim 33 moot.

[0030] Claims 34 and 36 depend from independent claim 32. As discussed above,

claim 32 is patentable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 34 and 36 are also

patentable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from a

patentable base claim. These claims may also be patentable for the additional features

that each recites.

Serial No.: 10/769,425 Atty Docket No.: MS1 -1911US Atty/Agent: Kayla D. Brant

lee@haves The Business of IP®

-20-

Independent Claim 37

[0031] Applicant submits that the Office has not made a prima facie showing that

independent claim 37 is obvious in view of the combination of Tang and Lee. As

discussed above with reference to claim 1, Applicant submits that the combination of

Tang and Lee does not teach or suggest the following features of this claim, as

amended (with emphasis added):

A mobile device comprising:

a device-specific processor;

a communication interface configured to establish a connection

between the mobile device an another device; and

a user interface executed by the device-specific processor to

enable a user of the mobile device to participate in an online group

interaction with one or more other members of a group, wherein

membership in the group is maintained when a user is offline.

[0032] Consequently, the combination of Tang and Lee does not teach or suggest all

of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests

that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 38 and 39

[0033] Claims 38 and 39 ultimately depend from independent claim 37. As discussed

above, claim Independent Claim is allowable / patentable over the cited documents.

Therefore, claims 38 and 39 are also patentable over the cited documents of record for

at least their dependency from a patentable base claim. These claims may also be

patentable for the additional features that each recites.

Serial No.: 10/769,425 Atty Docket No.: MS1 -1911US

Atty/Agent: Kayla D. Brant

-21- be@hayes The Business of IP*

www.leehayes.com * 509.324.9256

Claims 16-19 Are Non-Obvious Over Tang, Lee, and Puskala

[0034] Claims 16-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being

obvious over Tang in view of Lee, and further in view of Puskala. Applicant respectfully

traverses the rejection.

Dependent Claims 16-19

Claim 16 is canceled herein, rendering the rejection of claim 16 moot. [0035]

[0036] Claims 17-19 ultimately depend from independent claim 1. As discussed

above, claim 1 is patentable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 17-19 are

also patentable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from a

patentable base claim. These claims may also be patentable for the additional features

-22-

that each recites.

Serial No.: 10/769,425 Atty Docket No.: MS1 -1911US Atty/Agent: Kayla D. Brant



www.leehayes.com • 509.324.9256

Conclusion

[0037] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned representative for the Applicant before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC Representative for Applicant

/Kayla D. Brant #46,576/ Dated: March 12, 2009

Kayla D. Brant

(kayla@leehayes.com; 509-944-4742)

Registration No. 46576